The "Indo-European" syntax, derived from Turkish syntax, constitutes a historical regression in language

Kaan Arslanoğlu

February 24, 2024

We have reached the fifth and final chapter of the “**Arbin Word Roots Saga**”. What had the dreadful witch said: “First there was the word. You corrupted that word. The curse will never diminish from upon you...” What was the secret of this sagely judgment and magnificent prophecy? We will now explain it. What are the sociological reasons for this decay and decline in languages, what were its philosophical consequences?

F. Max Müller, one of the founding figures of European linguistics, had mentioned that in the areas where the societies known as Indo-Europeans emerged and lived, there were previously Turanian societies. This has been mentioned in the previous chapter. Max Müller had developed a racist theory, the so called “Aryan” theory. However, the realistic aspect of his personality led him to utter statements that align with the arguments I am currently defending. Is it a divine whisper? Or should we say, 'Behold, this is humanity, a mixture of falsehood and truth'? The transition from agglutinative languages to inflected languages is not progress but rather deterioration and regression. Humanity has formed all the 'great philosophies' so far with this mediocre language. That's why our species hasn't

come out smelling like rose. Now it’s the high time to prove this.

Max Müller was advocating the following theses in summary: Turanian languages constitute a broad group that spans a vast area, with distinct but noticeable common characteristics. Two of the most advanced forms are Finnish and Turkish. Tungusic, Mongolian, Turkish, Finnish, and Samoyedic languages form the northern group; Tamil languages, dialects of Tibet and Bhutan, Thai languages (dialects of Siam), Malay, and Polynesian languages constitute the southern group. (I cannot comment on the southern group as I have not studied it). These languages are agglutinative and are in the second stage of development, they cannot reach the third stage. Despite this, they possess significant structural advantages and provide linguistic conveniences. There is enough data to support the claim that Aryan languages developed from these stage, so they should be carefully examined. According to Max Müller, Semitic and Aryan languages, while representing a certain level of development, also demonstrate 'decay' and 'corruption.' If someone unintentionally reveals a truth, we say, 'God made him say so' in our culture. Freud, on the other hand, calls it a “slip of the tongue”...

Max Müller demonstrates the similarity of Sanskrit and Latin syntax to Turkish syntax by providing examples. Some paragraphs explaining these views are at the end of this article.

Latin, which is an intermediate form between Turkish syntax and German-English syntax

The Latins are of Etruscan origin, and the Etruscans were Turkic. We can understand this, through the resemblance of Turkish runic script to the Etruscan-Latin alphabet. When the Turks of Türkiye adopted the Latin alphabet in 1928, they discovered a remarkable harmony between Turkish and this alphabet, an alignment rarely seen in Western languages. **It was as if the Latin alphabet was designed specifically for Turkish.** You might be surprised, but it wasn't! Their ancient societies had a Turkic language already, so their alphabets were suitable for it... The fact that multiplying two by two always results in four is not a coincidence. Additionally, we can derive this truth from the ancestral wolf-mother myth (saver the race), primarily based on some mythological similarities and cultural overlaps. We can extract this from thousands of shared words.

Now, let's examine syntax, morphology, grammar...

In Latin, like in Turkish, a pronoun may or may not be present at the beginning of a sentence. In sentences without pronouns, the conjugation suffix is placed at the end of the verb, just like in Turkish. Many sentences start with a verb. The pronoun suffix is, as in Turkish, at the end of the verb. Latin is largely an agglutinative Turkic language. There is an auxiliary verb, but it is not present in every sentence. Like in Turkish, the auxiliary verb can come after the pronoun or, as in Turkish, be found at the very end of the sentence. In Turkish, there is no auxiliary verb in this context, but there are suffixes like "**dır**, **lar**" serving the same purpose. These suffixes are the roots of auxiliary verbs in Western languages. Nearly all the prefixes considered to have originated from Latin in Western languages are Turkic,

and, in fact, some of them are not even prefixes; they are remnants of Turkish words.

Let's provide some examples. The ones in red are in Turkish:

OKUdum Kİ = L**ego qu**od (**I-ego qu**od) … I have read that

Düşünüyor**UM** (**Ög**reniyor**um**) öyley**se** varım = **Cog**ito **ergo suM** … I think.. **so** I **am** present / Old Turkish '**ök**, **ög**' (mind); '**oku**' (read, understand); '**ögren**' (learn, know, gnos)

Biliyor**UM** (öğrendi**M**) ki ben**İM** = Cognos**co ergo suM** … I know that I **am**

Curro (Latin) = **KIR**dı**M** (**koş**tu**m**) … I run. "PIE root" '**kers**'

İlle currunt = **OL** (**O**) **KIR**dı (koştu) … He run.

OL, o, **onu** = **İlle**, **olle**, **eam**, **eum** … Him, her, it

Ego: **ög** (Old Turkish)

Sum (Latin) = **özüm** … I am

Us (Latin) = **özümüz**, b**iz** … Us (English) / **YUT**ar**IZ**, yeriz, **ED**er**İZ** (Old Turkish) (we **ate**)= **edo** (Latin) / **Ed**, **yut**: **ate** / **ız**, **uz** > **us**

İlli = onlar, **ollar**, **el** (distant person, foreigner)

Meus equus fessus est (the 'est' in the end) = **MENİM EŞKİNİM** argınDIR (est) (atım yorgundur) … My horse is tired

gladius meus acutus = kılıcı**M** keskin … My sword is sharp / Gladius meus (**KIL**ıç**IM**) / Besides, there is no auxiliary verb here in Latin

Est, **esti** = **Dı**, **di**, **dır** (suffix); **uş**, **işte** (here is) … > **is**

Onu ilikledim (bağladım) = **Eum ligavi** … I tied him

Caseum edunt = **Kesik yuttular** (peynir yediler) … They ate cheese

Birinci damı kaptım = **Pri**mum **dom**um **cep**i (Latin) … I had the first house.

Illius cor magnum est = **Ol** (onun) **cöröğü** (yüreği) **büyük**tür … His heart is big / **Beg**, mag, büyük (Turkish) > **magnum**, **big**

Serpens eum circumdedit = yılan (**sürünen**, **saran**) **onu SARdı** … The snake **sur**rounded her

Illi mihi de quo dixer**unt**? (Latin) = **Ollar mana kimi dedi**? … Who did they tell me about?

Magnas urbes creaverunt = **Büyük urunlar kurdular** … They created big cities

Tardus eligimus = **Duranları** (yavaşları) **eleriz** … We eliminate the slow ones

Nos < **biz** > we

Vos < **siz** (you – plural)

Ben, **men**, **menim**, **benim**; **um**, **am** … (suffixes) > am, may, me, mine < **um**, **am**, **mea**, **meus** (Latin)

The Latin issue is not over yet. It continues below.



Intensive Turkic Grammar in English and German

I mentioned Latin as a transitional form, a transitional form between Turkish and English-German, and other Western languages. However, it is an intermediate form in the sense of transition from agglutinative languages to inflected languages. Furthermore, German and English have borrowed many structural elements from Turanian-Turkic languages. I will provide some examples from countless instances below. However, there are clear agglutinative elements in these inflected languages as well. For example, the past tense verb conjugation in English directly echoes the trace of the Turkish past tense suffix '**dı**, **di**.' And the attachment of this conjugation suffix to the end of the verb is a clear agglutination. Sentences like '**I called**, **you demanded**' bear the stamp of the Turkish root. The '**d**, **ed**' in passive sentences is the same. It's exactly the copy of the Turkish structure suffixes '**ed**, **et**, **ettir**' (make him do it, had them do it, get her do it).

The '**ing**' suffix in English attached to the end of verbs is both an agglutinative remnant and Turkic: **getting** < gider**ing**; **turning** < döner**ing** (in local dialect pronunciation). Also, the personal pronoun suffix '**s**' in English is another residue of agglutination.

Additionally, in English, there are neither pronouns nor often auxiliary verbs in explanatory, complementary subordinate clauses. These Western languages are already cumbersome; if they didn't retain some agglutinative features, it would be even more challenging to convey things with them. In imperative sentences, there are no conjugations or rules at all. Bare Turkic roots are used. Here are some sentence examples (where are those inflected, pronominal languages in these subordinate clauses?).

Having finished our work, we went home.

Taking a key out of his pocket, he opened the door.

Having interrupted me, he began to tell his own story.

Having been interrupted, he didn’t want to go on with his story.

Ann didn’t see me **wave to her**.

And these are English morphological examples directly copied from Turkish structures:

I (Eng.), **ich** (German): **eg** “PIE root”, **I** (I am) / **I**, **ich** (German) < **ög** (mind, consciousness, self, ego, spirit) (Old Turkish) / 12c.,

a shortening of Old English **ic**, the first person singular nominative pronoun, from Proto-Germanic ***ek** (source also of Old Frisian **ik**, Old Norse **ek**, Norwegian **eg**, Danish jeg, Old High German ih, German **ich**, Gothic ik, **Hittite uk**, Latin ego (source of French je), **Greek ego**, Russian ja, Lithuanian aš). (OED) / **Ög** > **ego**, **ek**, **ich**, **I** …

Am: English auxiliary verb. “**Me** - **my**- **mine**” are also related. Note the relationship of the Turkish first person singular '**ben**': I and its old and in some dialects the present form '**men**'. Also in the sentence of Turkish "geliyor-**um**": “I am coming” sentence, '**m**-**um**' denotes the first person singular and replaces '**am**'. This rule applies to all sentences in the first person singular.

German “**Ich bin**”: I am / **bin** < **ben**

We: **biz**, **miz** (Turkish) first person plural (we). **We** < **biz**. Gidiyor-**uz**: We are getting out. Here Turkish '**uz**' suffix is identical to English pronoun '**us**'. In all sentences belonging to the first person plural in Turkish, the verb ending with '**ız**-**uz**-**iz**' indicates the first person plural. French '**nous**' < **biz**, **uz**.

is < **uş**, **işte** (Old and Middle Turkish – here is, there is) > **est** (Latin)

Do, **did**: '**et**, **ed**' in Turkish, '**tan**' in Old Turkish, '**tu**' in Chuvash (to make). Latin '**edo**, **uti**' have similar meanings.

English question words **who**, **how**, **what**, **when**, **which**, **where**: They connect to “PIE root” '**kwo**'. Let's compare it with Turkish question words. **Kim** > **kwo** > **who** > **qui** (Latin) / **kaç** > **kwo** > **how much** > **quot** (Latin) > **quanti** (Italian) >

quantos (Spanish) / **hangi**, **hanki**, **kankı** > **kwo** > which, what > quod, quisnom, quantus (Latin) / **kanda** (Old Turkish) > **kwo** > when > **quando** (Latin)

Be, **been** (English): Turkish '**ol**-mak', Old Turkish '**bol**-mak': become, be. / Alleged “PIE root”: ‘**bheue**’ (to be, exist, grow) / Turkish ‘**büyü**’: grow, ‘**bit**’: exist / **Belir**: emerge, appear. Also Turkish '**belli**': certain, clear / Old Turkish '**belgü**': evidence, indication.

Have, **had**: “PIE root” '**kap**'. Turkish '**kap**': grasp, hold, seize / kap: cup, vessel / **kapla**: cover / **kapsa**: contain / **kapan**: trap. As you can see, there is a “PIE root” commonality. 'Havi' (Turkish, Arabic): have.

Need: As a grammatical element in English. “Middle English nor, from Old English nied (West Saxon), ned (Mercian) ‘what is required, wanted, or desired; necessity, compulsion, the constraint of unavoidable circumstances; duty; hardship, emergency, trouble, time of peril or distress…' ” It may be derived from Turkish '**ne et**': What do? Turkish '**et**-**ed**' is a verb root. It means 'do, make'.

Get: (also **had**) The grammatical element of getting someone to do something. I get him painted the wall: Ona duvarı boya-**t**-ırım / The Turkish '**t**' suffix here is an abbreviation of the Turkish '**et**-**tir**' and is compatible with '**get**', ‘**had**’.

Can: The Turkish suffix '**ken**-**gen**' (maker) both increases the effect and power of the verb and makes a noun or adjective

from the verb. 'Et': do / et-**ken**: active, dominant, factor / geçir-**gen**: permeable etc.

Could, **should**, **would**: These English grammatical elements are compatible with Turkish '**oldur**' in terms of meaning and phonetics. **Oldur**: get it done, get it made.

Make: **mek**, **mak**, **ma** (Turkish infinitive suffixes). Compatible with English '**make**'. Yap-**mak**: do-ing, making.

When: Turkish '**anda**, **ında**, **inde**' etc. When you came: geldi-ğ-**inde**. **When** < **an** (the moment, time).

She, **he**: English third person singular. She < **tişi**, **dişi** (female) / **kişi**: person (she, he).

Are < **lar** / **They are** = **on-lar**

Was: **is** < **uş**, **uşteg** (here is, there is); **biz**, **biziz** (we, we are)

Were: like "**was**" and Turkish **var** (there is, present)

Neither… **nor**: **ne**, **ne de** … Neither this nor that: ne bu **ne de** şu.

There: **orada**, **orada-dır**; **there is** (**oradadır**)

Will, **shall**: Turkish '**bil**': to know, realise, understand, think, accept, approve (decide), and also 'can', 'ability' (yap-**abil**-mek) **abilis** (Latin), **able** / Turkish '**ol**, **bol**' (be, become) > **will**, **shall**

Prefixes:

Ab, **ad** (**e-a**): **e**, **a** (direction); **ab**: **öbürü**; **ante**: **önde**; **alter**: **alt**, **alt üst**; **ana**: with many and ambiguous meanings (PIE root: **on**): **önde**, **ön** **-** general, main: **ana**; **com**: **kamu**, **kamug**, (community); **con**: **kon**, **kenet**, **kengeş**, **kopgı**, **kolbo**, **koş**; **coop**: **kop**, **kopça**; **col** (collect): **kolbo**, **göl**; **de**: **değil**; **dis**: **değil**, **düş**; **dual**, **du**: secundo > **ikili**, **ikinci**, **tüng**, **tüngai**; **in**, **endo**: **engiz**, **ingiz**, **endir** (Kirghiz); **intra**: **in-doğru**; **inter**: **in-yer**; **eu**: **iyi**; **e x**: **eksi**, **eksilmiş**, **çık**, **'ks'** (öksürük, aksırık...); **extra**: **ek**; **ecto**: **ek**; **gene**: **can** 'yan'; **iso**: **eşit**; **juxta**: **yakın**; **cross**: **karşı**; **contra**: **karşı**; **circum**: **sar**, **sarmal**; **epi**: **hep**; **ob**: **oyuk**, **kovuk**, **obruk** (hole), **aba** (up); **multi**: **mol**, **bol**; **poly**: **bol**, **mol**; **no**, **none**, **not**: **ne**; **omni**: **yeme** (all) (Radloff); **uni**: **ön**, **en** (first, unic); **quadro**: **dört**; **tetra**: **dört**; **para**, **peri**: **beri**; **pro**: **bir**, **birinci**; **pre**: **bir**, **birincil**; **per**: **her**; **syn**: **sinme** (absorb), **sün** (insert); **ultra**: **öte**, **ulu**; **up**, **upper**, **upon**: **kop**, **aba**, **apa**; **mal**: **bela**, **bula**; **trans**: **ters**, ak**tar**, **doğru** ...

German prefixes '**zer**, **er**, **ver**, **be**' explicitly connotate Turkic sounds and meanings. I have explained these and much more in a comprehensive dictionary:

DICTIONARY of TURKISH ROOTS in WESTERN LANGUAGES:

https://www.academia.edu/111458574/DICTIONARY_OF_TURKISH_ROOTS_IN_WESTERN_LANGUAGES

Some suffixes in common with Turkish

-al (Eng. - Latin): a suffix makes noun. Spiritual, congenital, anim-al… / In Turkish this same (**-al**) suffix has same function. Sak (head); sakal, sak-**al** (beard)

as (Eng.): **-sı**, **-si** (suffix). Mavim-**si**: blu-**ish**

-cy (**si**) (Eng.): suffix. It expresses quality and status. Samples: 'intima**cy**', 'idio**cy**'. In Turkish there is a similar '**-si**, **-sı**' suffix. Yakın**sı** … Kırmızım-**sı** … (as near, as red). These are like English '**as**', but they still indicate status. Gele**si**, gide-**si** (these also indicate the situation).

em (-em, **-m)** (Eng.): suffix. Syst-**em**, custo**m**, idio**m**… In Turkish same: söyle-**m**, yönte**m**

en, **-en** (Eng.) suffix: become. Like in 'enlighten, awaken' words mean 'maker'. / **-an**, **-n**, **-yant** (Hittite suffixes): maker. In Turkish this suffix is same: **-an**, **-en** (yap**-an**, gid**-en** - doer)

endo (**-endo**) (Eng. - Latin): suffix. These make the 'gerund' form, like the English '**-ing**'. We think that it is the same as the **(e)nd(e)** suffix, which is still used in Anatolia but has been forgotten in Istanbul Turkish. Examples: Yap**anda**, ed-**ende**, gel**ende**, gid-**ende**… (ing – endo) / Also in current regular Turkish "yaptı-ğ**ın-da**, yaptığ**ında**": when you do … **ın** (time) > **when**

enty (**-enty**), **-inty** (Eng.); **-entum** (Latin): suffix that makes noun from verb. In Turkish 'ak-**ıntı**, sık**ıntı**' …

er, (**-er**) (Eng.): suffix. Yap**ar**, ed**er** (doer, maker). The suffix '-er, -ar' in Turkish is the same as in English: swimmer, runner, writer

gy, **gy-** (Eng.): suffix. For instance ‘lo**gy**, psycholo**gy**, allergy, clergy’ … Turkish ‘**-cı**, **-ci**’ suffix is very similar. It denotes (doer, maker) like English ‘**-er**’ suffix (kazı**cı**, kapı**cı**); or make adjective (etkileyi**ci**)

ic (**-ic**) (Eng.): Suffix. Examples: psychiatr**ic**, log**ic**, eccentr**ic**… Same in Turkish: '-**ik**, **-ık**' … Şımar**ık**, çab**uk**, çev**ik**, kal**ık**, del**ik** etc.

ig, (**-ig**) (German): suffix makes adjectives from words. Jährig, ständig, grundig, schwierig, verdächtig, vorläufig, einzig, wichtig, richtig … Same in English: numeric. Also Turkish '-**ik**, **-ık**' suffix makes adjectives from words: kızar**ık**, şımar**ık**, bulan**ık**, kabar**ık**, karmaş**ık**, sırnaş**ık**, deriş**ik**…

Lemma (Eng. - Greek): like in ‘di**lemma**’ or ‘ana-lemma’, (to take: **al**-mak) or suffix ‘-**le**, **-leme**’, ‘+**lm**’. (-la, -le: Turkish suffix that makes verb from name or adjective) (+lm: Turkish piece that produces action name from verb: iki**lem**, iki**leme**, kap**lama**, fır**lama**, par**lama** etc.).

Less (-less) (Eng.): suffix that gives the meaning of “none” to the word it comes in front of. Just like the Turkish '-**siz**, **-sız**'. **Door-less**: Kapı-**sız**

Lich (-lich) (German): the suffix that makes words adjectives: Zuversicht**lich**, müd**lich**, sorg**lich**, gefährlich, schließlich,

endlich, plötzlich, wirklich … In Turkish '**-lik**, **-lık**, **-lek**, **-lak**' suffixes are same: Evladiye**lik**, hediye**lik**, topar**lak**, içer**lek**...

Ly (-ly) (Eng.): suffix. Exactly same in Turkish with '**li**' suffix. Love**ly**: Sevim**li**. **-li**, **lik** > **like-ly** <> **ig-lich** (German)

s (-s) (Eng.): word ending plural suffix. In Chuvash Turkish '**z**' is plural suffix / There are only a few words left in today's Turkish like at 'iki-**z**, üçü-**z**' (twin, triplet baby) / Ben-bi**z** (we, first person plural); sen-si**z** (plural of 'you')

sy (**-sy**) (Eng.): suffix. 'folksy, artsy, autesy, clumsy' … Turkish '**sı-si**' suffix is same. Sarım**sı**, acım**sı**, ekşim**si**

tion, **-tion** (Eng.); -**cion**' (Fr.): suffix. In Turkish vernecular: geli**şin**, gidi**şin**, çıkı**şın** … '**Şin-şın**' here denotes 'when I do, as I do, if I do'. eylemi yaptığım takdirde, o durumda anlamı verir. Another similar one is the suffix '**-yon**', which indicates the aorist and continuation of the action: geli**yon**, gidi**yon**, çıkı**yon** (vernecular). / **Şin**, **şın** > **tion**; **yon** > **cion**

tor, **teur** (-tor, -teur) (Eng. – Fr.): suffix. Turkish suffixes '**-r**, **-er**, **-ar**' and '**-dar**, -**tar**' do same function in present tense. Silah**tar**, kılıç**dar**… (do**er**, mak**er** < yap**ar**)

um, **-um** (Latin): suffix. It makes name, like '**bell-um**'. In Turkish there is same suffix, '-**um**'. '**Doğ-um**, sok-um, oy-um' … / In Turkish, it takes various forms under the influence of some additional vowel rules: 'Al-**ım**, sat-ım, kal-ım, öl-**üm**, sür-üm, ver-**im**, dür-üm, giy-im, dil-im' (V . Hatiboğlu) / The '**-ım**' suffix creates abstract nouns from verb roots in Turkish as well as in

Latin. A few examples such as 'öl-**üm**, bat-**ım**' formed with the suffix '-ım' are used in the Orkhon Inscriptions.

unda, **-unda** (Latin): suffix. Turkish '**de-da**'. Sek**undo**, sekundos: İkinci, ikincis**i-n-de**

us, **-us** (Latin): suffix. Turkish '-**ış**' suffix is similar to '-**us**'. Kalk-**ış**, var-**ış**, vur**uş**, dur**uş** ...

Is the transition from an agglutinative language to an inflected one a progress or a regression?

All languages are marvelous for those who use them fluently and effectively. Inflected languages are no exception. However, if we have to answer the question, the transition to today's German, French, English, etc., from a syntactic perspective, is, in my opinion, a regression. I mentioned above that it makes the language cumbersome. To overcome this and gain movement and fluency, these languages often use agglutinative features of their ancestor languages, as shown in the examples above.

Why did the transition to inflected languages occur? It is impossible to set out in full. However, my hypothesis is that as languages mix, hybridize, creolize, the necessity to simplify them arises. More precisely, the opposite. These languages have simplified and acquired features of pidgin languages because they are creole languages. This simplification naturally occurred for tribes that moved away from Turanian, Turkic roots and did not understand each other.

As societies became more crowded and cities emerged, human social intelligence turned out to be insufficient for this complexity. This weakened the language. It increased the abuse of language. As different tribes came together, the language also deteriorated. The essence of the language was rotting. In the course of time this has been explained to us as a development.

In Turkish, the verb, thought, intention, and situation come first. In inflected Western languages, the pronoun comes first. Probably communities that did not know each other well or knew each other less felt the need to introduce themselves, to put the pronoun forward. This is also the result of the society starting to separate, people starting to drift apart, and social classes emerging. Action, thought, intention are not in the foreground, but individuals are. In the Old Turkish of a communal society, it is important to indicate not primarily the person but rather their action or thought. Additionally, these communal societies are generally very dynamic. Contrary to popular belief, not all ancient Turks were nomadic. Even among the nomads, not everyone was constantly on the move. Even in urban communities, there were seasonal or annual relocations. Ancient Turks were societies that were very inclined towards movement, and their language was suitable for that. The world's most migratory people they happened to be. Migration, animal husbandry, agriculture, production, war, state... A dynamic language had to meet their needs. The main principle of Mother Turanian language is: The shortest, the most

meaningful. **A language like computer software.** According to the law of natural selection. Or?

In Türkiye, we call the speech of people who do not understand each other's language, with a limited vocabulary, and speak in a simple, disjointed syntax as '**Tarzanian speech**, Tarzanese speech.' The transition to inflected languages is a transition to speaking in Tarzanese.

Unnecessarily using pronouns and a separate auxiliary verb in every sentence slows down the language, fragments sentence meaning, and kills the liveliness of expression. In Turkish, you use pronouns if you want and if necessary. On the other hand, the pronoun is already at the end of the verb in Turkish, and you don't use it unless necessary.

It is cold here.

It’s no use worrying about it.

It is drizzling.

Does it hurt here?

It is difficult to find.

Now comes up the critical question: What's drizzling? What hurts? What's cold? In these sentences 'it' is redundant and distorts the meaning.

She almost fell over as she came down the stairs. For example, a sentence like this seems normal to everyone now

because English has become a dominant language. Yes, it's normal, but it is a fragmented, disjointed, additive, and lifeless narrative. It is not a dynamic expression. When literally translated, it will seem like Tarzanese to us.



In an American movie, a person approaches a corpse and says, "**He is dead**." As if a creature from outer space has come, encountered an object, and is reporting. It's a dull expression that only reflects the current situation. Was that object always dead, has it never lived? Did it just die, or did it die months ago? Is it just a body with bones left? In a Turkish movie, the person seeing the corpse in the same situation would say, "**Ölmüş**". Just that. 'Ölmüş' (He has been dead). Here, there is a complete description of the situation and time in a dynamic style, and there is also emotion.

We had an argument... In Turkish, you simply say 'tartıştık.' It's challenging to explain the awkwardness and dullness of the

inflective language to someone who doesn't know Turkish. That's exactly what I want to explain.

This syntax is a collection syntax. Inconsistency abounds. From there, they produced philosophical systems based solely on sentence games and wordplays. This is not the only reason why the philosophy of the last three centuries lags behind even the philosophy of Aristotle and Plato in terms of logic and harmony with reality, but this is one of the reasons.

You cannot express yourself quickly and in compliance with the rules in English. A brief example: Someone is calling you, and you want to inform them that you will come right away. You should say 'I am coming.' Instead, for a quicker expression, you just say 'coming.' This means 'to come,' nonsense, and it is not in accordance with the rule.

If you made someone do something, you have to use a word like 'made, make, get, got, had' to form that pronoun. 'Made him, get her,' etc... It's as if you are making that person. Congratulations, you are all human creators! There is no distinction and flexibility.

In Turkish, there is another past tense form with "**mış** (miş, muş, müş)." It is used to describe an event or situation that you haven't personally witnessed or experienced, but rather was conveyed to you. For example, "Dün gitmiş". This narrative form and this “tense” doesn't have an exact equivalent in Western languages. In English, to express a similar situation, we might say something like "They say that he has gone yesterday." (Sibel Küçükoğlu)

David Bowie's song "**Yaşasın**" is translated into English as "Long Live". Because there is no exact equivalent of "Yaşasın" in English. Its literal equivalent is "May she/he/it live long". As you can see, in English you have to express many things with long and cumbersome expressions, or with some short words like exclamation.

In Turkish, for the 3rd person singular, whether it's a woman, man, animal, or object, there is only '**o**' ('he/she/it'). In English, there are 'he, she, it...' which may seem like a more advanced feature. However, when you need to refer to a general 3rd person singular, which one will you choose? All of them? This is a problem. Especially the separation of articles and adjectives as feminine and masculine in German is another oddity. In Turkish, there is a feature of combining genders in the same words. For example, in ancient Turkish, '**oğul**' means child-cion, used for both girls and boys. When gender needs to be specified, you say '**kır oğul**' (girl) or '**er oğul**' (boy)."

In Western languages, situations where a letter or syllable is pronounced differently here and completely differently there, or where the same letter has three different sounds in the same word or name, are very common: Pacific Ocean. Each '**c**' here produces a different sound. Sometimes, three letters are used together just to produce a single sound. Letter waste. If you don't know how a word is pronounced beforehand, you can't pronounce it correctly by looking at the letters. This situation indicates the inconsistency of these languages with the Latin alphabet and also shows that these languages are highly mixed, creol. Turkish words are pronounced exactly as they are

written, each letter producing a distinct single sound, and there is complete compatibility with the Latin alphabet.

Are sounds, syllables, and words truly random and meaningless?

Structuralism, semiotics, concepts of signifier and signified, etc., preached that sounds, syllables, and even words are randomly and meaninglessly formed elements, devoid of causality. These views became dominant worldwide. At one point, some, like the French Academy of Sciences, even prohibited the investigation of the origins of words. Of course, curiosity broke through all those prohibitions, and the exploration of sources and origins did not stop. However, this time, they began to claim that the magnificent languages of the "Aryan nations" suddenly emerged 3-4 thousand years ago with the fabricated Indo-European theory. The root of Indo-European words was itself, and its syntax was a sudden miracle.

Olcas Süleymanov waged war against all these doctrines that obscure origins and causality in his book 'The Language of Writing,' published in 1997. According to him, human speech had developed parallel to writing, and if priority had to be given, writing came first. Many concepts and words were born from the first written signs, symbols, and letters (hieroglyphs). The relationship between the moon and the bull was the most emphasized root. The hieroglyphic signs for this were moon, buu, buc, etc... Are all the examples he provided accurate? It's debatable. However, his perspective should have brought a new dimension to linguistics.

Max Müller, whom we mentioned earlier, was also in pursuit of the origins. He emphasized the creation of common words from natural sounds. We cannot explain every word with onomatopoeia, but with a serious approach, it can be shown that many words originated from sound. For example, I believe that the Turkish word "**kap**" (capture, capere, grasp, catch, bite) originated from the capturing sound of an animal's jaw or beak. Examples can be multiplied.

I had written another thesis before. In many languages, the letter '**İ**' is more frequent in words expressing pointedness or thinness. The letters '**o**' and '**u**' are more common in words expressing roundness, while the letters '**u**' and '**v**' are more common in words expressing curvature. In Turkish, these ratios are even higher. İnce, sivri, iğne, iplik, diken (thin, pointed, needle, thread, thorn) ... Oluk, oyuk, obruk, top, yumurta, boru (groove, hollow, sinkhole, ball, egg, pipe) ... **Curve** < **kıvır** etc... This is likely related to the shape the mouth takes when producing words for these objects.

Ancient Harmony of Etruscan Latin Alphabets with Turkish Alphabets and the Magic of "I, O, U" Letters

https://www.academia.edu/86406588/Ancient_Harmony_of_Etruscan_Latin_Alphabets_with_Turkish_and_Turkish_Alphabets_and_the_Magic_of_I_O_U_Letters

If sounds and words were truly devoid of meaning, as Saussure posited, one might wonder how numerous common words persist across tribes residing tens of thousands of kilometers apart, spanning tens of millennia of shared human history.

With the advancement of technology, computer technology, and brain neuroscience, we may be able to obtain more detailed and precise information about the causality and origins of words.

FINAL WORD: What we have narrated is the epic of the Turanian-Turkic tribe, the ancestor of European peoples and many other nations (R, R1b, and more R1a). First, there was the word, but the word got corrupted. If it hadn't been corrupted, perhaps the world would have been a more livable place. However, the laws of nature are inexorable. Humans are a natural part of that nature. They will continue their natural life with both goodness and more evil. Focus on the future, not the past. Human intelligence is not very bright. Its social intelligence is a disaster. Efforts should be made to prevent racism and the malicious academy from further hindering this intelligence. This is the only way we can get rid of the curse upon us.

Thanks to Sibel Küçükoğlu for the edition

VIDEO - Turkish, which founded the Western Languages: the stubbornly rejected fact:
https://www.academia.edu/115055161/Turkish_which_founded_the_Western_Languages_the_stubbornly_rejected_fact

Quotes from Max Müller (Lectures on the Science of Language, 1861)

“A Turanian might tolerate the Sanskrit,

as-mi, a-si, as-ti, 's-mas, 's-tha, 's-anti,

I am, thou art, he is, we are, you are, they are;

or even the Latin,

's-um, e-s, es-t, 'su-mus, es-tis, 'sunt.

In these instances, with a few exceptions, root and affix are as distinguishable as, for instance, in Turkish:

bakar-im, bakar-sin, bakar,

I regard, thou regardest, he regards.

bakar-iz, bakar-siniz, bakar-lar

we regard, you regard, they regard”

“The most ingenious part of Turkish is undoubtedly the verb. Like Greek and Sanskrit, it exhibits a variety of moods and tenses, sufficient to express the nicest shades of doubt, of surmise, of hope, and supposition.

In all these forms the root remains intact, and sounds like a key-note through all the various modulations produced by the changes of person, number, mood, and time. But there is one feature so peculiar to the Turkish verb, that no analogy can be found in any of the Aryan languages—the power of producing new verbal bases by the mere addition of certain letters, which

give to every verb a negative, or causative, or reflexive, or reciprocal meaning.”

“ “These Turanian languages,” I said, “cannot be considered as standing to each other in the same relation as Hebrew and Arabic, Sanskrit and Greek.” “They are radii diverging from a common centre, not children of a common parent.” And still they are not so widely distant as Hebrew and Sanskrit, because none of them has entered into that new phase of growth or decay through which the Semitic and Aryan languages passed after they had been settled, individualized, and nationalized.”

“In the latter most words and grammatical forms were thrown out but once by the creative power of one generation, and they were not lightly parted with, even though their original distinctness had been blurred by phonetic corruption.”

“The most characteristic feature of the Turanian languages is what has been called Agglutination, or “gluing together.” This means not only that, in their grammar, pronouns are glued to the verbs in order to form the conjugation, or prepositions to substantives in order to form declension. That would not be a distinguishing characteristic of the Turanian or nomad languages; for in Hebrew as well as in Sanskrit, conjugation and declension were originally formed on the same principle. What distinguishes the Turanian languages is, that in them the conjugation and declension can still be taken to pieces; and although the terminations have by no means always retained their significative power as independent words, they are felt as

modificatory syllables, and as distinct from the roots to which they are appended.”

“There was a very good reason why the Turanian languages should have remained in this second or agglutinative stage. It was felt essential that the radical portion of each word should stand out in distinct relief, and never be obscured or absorbed, as happens in the third or inflectional stage.
And this will make it still more clear why the Turanian languages, or in fact all languages in this second or agglutinative stage, though protected against phonetic corruption more than the Aryan and Semitic languages, are so much exposed to the changes produced by dialectical regeneration. A Turanian retains, as it were, the consciousness of his language and grammar. The idea, for instance, which he connects with a plural is that of a noun followed by a syllable indicative of plurality; a passive with him is a verb followed by a syllable expressive of suffering, or eating, or going.”

“To myself the study of the Turanian family was interesting particularly because it offered an opportunity of learning how far languages, supposed to be of a common origin, might diverge and become dissimilar by the unrestrained operation of dialectic regeneration.”

“These coincidences must, however, be accounted for by those who deny the common origin of the Turanian languages; they must be accounted for, either as the result of accident, or of an imitative instinct which led the human mind everywhere to the same onomatopoëtic formations.

This has never been done, and it will require great efforts to achieve it. And as I look upon this process of agglutination as the only intelligible means by which language can acquire a grammatical organization, and clear the barrier which has arrested the growth of the Chinese idiom, I felt justified in applying the principles derived from the formation of the Turanian languages to the Aryan and Semitic families. They also must have passed through an agglutinative stage, and it is during that period alone that we can account for the gradual divergence and individualization of what we afterwards call the Aryan and Semitic forms of speech. If we can account for the different appearance of Mandshu and Finnish, we can also account for the distance between Hebrew and Sanskrit. It is true that we do not know the Aryan speech during its agglutinative period, but we can infer what it was when we see languages like Finnish and Turkish approaching more and more to an Aryan type. **Such has been the advance which Turkish has made towards inflectional forms, that Professor Ewald claims for it the title of a synthetic language, a title which he gives to the Aryan and Semitic dialects after they have left the agglutinative stage, and entered into a process of phonetic corruption and dissolution.** “Many of its component parts,” he says, “though they were no doubt originally, as in every language, independent words, have been reduced to mere vowels, or have been lost altogether, so that we must infer their former presence by the changes which they have wrought in the body of the word. Göz means eye, and gör, to see; ish, deed, and ir, to do; îtsh, the interior, gîr, to enter.”

Nay, he goes so far as to admit some formal elements which Turkish shares in common with the Aryan family, and which therefore could only date from a period when both were still in their agglutinative infancy. For instance, di, as exponent of a past action; ta, as the sign of the past participle of the passive; lu, as a suffix to form adjectives. This is more than I should venture to assert.”

My Note: **Heinrich G. Ewald, showing the morphological similarity of Altaic, Indo-European, Semitic languages. R. Caldwell, the founder of Dravitology, also grouped Dravitan languages, Semitic languages and Altaic languages into the "Saka" family.**

Let's continue with Müller:

“The real object of my Essay was therefore a defensive one. It was to show how rash it was to speak of different independent beginnings in the history of human speech, before a single argument had been brought forward to establish the necessity of such an admission. The impossibility of a common origin of language has never been proved, but, in order to remove what were considered difficulties affecting the theory of a common origin, I felt it my duty to show practically, and by the very history of the Turanian languages, how such a theory was possible, or as I say in one instance only, probable. I endeavored to show how even the most distant members of the Turanian family, the one spoken in the north, the other in the south of Asia, the Finnic and the Tamulic, have preserved in their grammatical organization traces of a former unity; and, if

my opponents admit that I have proved the ante-Brahmanic or Tamulic inhabitants of India to belong to the Turanian family, they can hardly have been aware that if this, the most extreme point of my argument be conceded, everything else is involved, and must follow by necessity.

Yet I did not call the last chapter of my Essay, “On the Necessity of a common origin of Language,” but “On the Possibility;” and, in answer to the opinions advanced by the opposite party, I summed up my defence in these two paragraphs:

Nothing necessitates the admission of different independent beginnings for the material elements of the Turanian, Semitic, and Aryan branches of speech;—nay, it is possible even now to point out radicals which, under various changes and disguises, have been current in these three branches ever since their first separation.”